

**STATEMENT OF FACTS**

1. Applicant filed a patent application on 15 October 2001 setting forth claims 1-15.
2. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office mailed a non-final Office action on 28 August 2003 (Paper No. 6). The Examiner rejected claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Cheney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,283). Concerning the rejection in Paper No. 6, a large portions of the text were quoted from the reference by the Examiner, however, the particular parts being relied on for all of the elements of the claims were not provided in Paper No. 6.
3. Applicant filed an Amendment on 25 November 2003. Claims 1, 6 and 10 were amended. The Amendment filed on 25 November 2003 included remarks respectfully requesting the Examiner provide Applicant with clarification of the particular parts being relied on for all of the elements of the claims under 37 C.F.R. §1.104.
4. The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office mailed a final Office action on 16 January 2004 (Paper No. 8). Claims 1-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheney et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,519,283) in Paper No. 8. In regard with the rejection in Paper No. 8, the Examiner did not provide Applicant with complete clarification of the particular parts being relied on for all of the elements of the claims.